

REMARKS

This paper is submitted in response to the Office action mailed on November 24, 2009. This paper amends claims 1, 3, 5, 29, and 31 and cancels claims 4, 8, 17, and 19-28. Accordingly, after entry of this Amendment and Response, claims 1-3, 5-10, and 29-31 will be pending.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office action rejects claims 1-10, 17, and 19-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Starkovich et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,993,585) (hereinafter "Starkovich") in view of Ng (U.S. Patent No. 6,411,956) (hereinafter "Ng"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

A proper obviousness rejection based on a rationale of combining prior art elements requires at least "a finding that the prior art included each element claimed...with the only difference between the claimed invention and the prior art being the lack of actual combination of the elements." MPEP § 2143(A). See also *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 985 (C.C.P.A. 1974); *CFMT, Inc. v. YieldUp Int'l Corp.*, 349 F.3d 1333, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2003). For at least the reasons stated below, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-10, 17, and 19-31 are not obvious over Starkovich in view of Ng.

Amended independent claim 1 recites "generating a customized connector interface...by modifying said generic connector interface based on said received information by: adding said first interface to the Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file...and creating a Customized Resource Adaptor Archive (CRAR) file by modifying a deployment descriptor of the Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file" and "connecting...said information system to said hardware application server via said customized connector interface utilizing the Customized Resource Adaptor Archive (CRAR) file, wherein said customized connector interface provides access to said information system through said first interface of said information system." Claim 29 recites similar limitations. For at least the following reasons, the Assignee respectfully asserts that the combination of Starkovich and Ng does not teach or suggest the above features.

Neither Starkovich nor Ng teach or suggest adding a first interface to a Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file and creating a Customized Resource Adaptor Archive (CRAR) file by modifying a deployment descriptor of the Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file. In fact, neither Starkovich nor Ng mention a Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file or a Customized Resource Adaptor Archive (CRAR) file at all. Thus, the combination of Starkovich and Ng does not teach or suggest creating a Customized Resource Adaptor Archive (CRAR) file by modifying a deployment descriptor of the Generic

Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file. Hence, the combination of Starkovich and Ng cannot teach or suggest creating a customized connector interface that includes the Customized Resource Adaptor Archive (CRAR) file and connecting an information system to a hardware application server via the customized connector interface.

The Office action correctly admitted, with respect to former claim 22, that Starkovich does not disclose modifying a Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file based on one or more properties to generate a Customized Resource Adaptor Archive (CRAR) file. *See Office Action dated November 24, 2009; page 13.* The Office action then cited to col. 3, lines 40-44 of Ng as disclosing this limitation. *See Office Action dated November 24, 2009; page 13.*

However, the cited section of Ng discusses fulfilling multiple database connection requests through the same physical database connection using a mapping in a table rather than creating a new physical database connection for each connection request. *Ng; col. 3, lines 40-49.* Handling multiple database connection requests through the same physical database connection using a mapping in a table is not creating a Customized Resource Adaptor Archive (CRAR) file by modifying a deployment descriptor of the Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file. Ng does not even mention a Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file or a Customized Resource Adaptor Archive (CRAR) file, much less creating a Customized Resource Adaptor Archive (CRAR) file by modifying a deployment descriptor of the Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file. Thus, Ng does not cure the defects of Starkovich.

In short, the combination of Starkovich and Ng does not teach or suggest the limitations of claims 1 and 29. As such, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 29 are patentable over the combination of Starkovich and Ng. Claims 2-3, 5-10, and 30-31 depend from claims 1 and 29, respectively, and the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-3, 5-10, and 30-31 are allowable at least due to their dependence on an allowable base claim. Claims 4, 8, 17, and 19-28 have been cancelled and the Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections are moot with regards to these claims.

II. Conclusion

The Assignee thanks the Examiner for his thorough review of the application. The Assignee respectfully submits the present application, as amended, is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the issuance of a Notice of Allowability as soon as practicable.

The Assignee believes no fees or petitions are due with this filing. However, should any such fees or petitions be required, please consider this a request therefor and authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 04-1415 as necessary.

If the Examiner should require any additional information or amendment, please contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated: Feb. 18, 2010

Respectfully submitted,



Gregory P. Dunlap, Registration No. 42,503
Attorney for Assignee
USPTO Customer No. 66083

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
Republic Plaza Building, Suite 4700
370 Seventeenth Street
Denver, Colorado 80202-5647
Phone: (303) 629-3400
Fax: (303) 629-3450